

Pathfinder
Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros, Inc.
120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000).

LAW JOURNALS AND OTHER ARTICLES

1. Jeffrey S. Edelstein & Cathy L. Lueders, *Recent Developments in Trade Dress Infringement Law*, 40 IDEA 105 (2000).
2. Symposium, *Trade Dress Protection: The Issue of Distinctiveness and Potential Conflicts*, 27 N. KY. L. REV. 1041 (2000).
3. Hugh C. Hansen, *How do you Determine when "Trade Dress" Protection Protects a Dress?*, 4 A.B.A. 217 (1999).
4. Ronald L. Panitch et al., *Trade Dress and Product Configuration: Different Circuits-Different Approaches*, SE32 A.L.I. 1 (1999).
5. Jeffery M. Samuels & Linda B. Samuels, *Highlights of Opinions Affecting PTO Trademark Practice*, 82 J. PAT. & TRADEMARK OFF. SOC'Y 311 (2000).
6. Siegrun D. Kane, *Trademark Infringement Litigation 2000: "Eyes Wide Shut"*, 599 P.L.I./PAT 481 (2000).
7. Lisa I. Fried, *High Court Makes Guarding Product Design Harder Trademark Case*, 223 N.Y.L.J. 5 (2000).
8. Robert S. Greenberger et al., *Wal-Mart Wins Reversal in Trademark Lawsuit*, WALL ST. J., Mar. 23, 2000, at A3.
9. Julius Rabinowitz, *'Wal-Mart' Clarifies Product Appearance Trade Dress*, NAT'L L.J., May 1, 2000, at C4.
10. Dugie Sandeford, *Supreme Court Hears Arguments on Test for 'Inherent Distinctiveness'*, 5 INTELL. PROP. STRATEGIST 6 (2000).
11. Martin P. Hoffman et al., *Design Patents/Other Types of Product Protection*, SE44 A.L.I. 161 (2000).
12. Mary Anne Pazanowski, *Product Design is Distinctive or Protectible only if it Acquired Secondary Meaning*, 6 INTELL. PROP. STRATEGIST 6 (2000).
13. Craig S. Mende, *How the Hight Court Sliced the Safety Net Against Knockoffs*, BRANDWEEK, Aug. 21, 2000, at 30.

TREATISES

1. JOHN W. HAZARD, JR., COPYRIGHT LAW IN BUSINESS AND PRACTICE 1-42 (rev. ed. 2000).
2. STEVEN Z. SZCZEPANSKI & DAVID M. ESTEIN, ECKSTROM'S LICENSING IN FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC OPERATIONS § 4.04 (1997-2000).
3. JEROME GILSON., GILSON ON TRADEMARK PROTECTION & Practice chs. 5-7 (2000).
4. J. THOMAS MCCARTHY, MCCARTHY ON TRADEMARKS (4th ed. 2000).

CASES

1. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000).
2. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 308 (1999).
3. Samara Bros. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 165 F.3d 120 (2d Cir. 1998)
4. Samara Bros. v. Judy-Philippine, Inc., 969 F. Supp. 895 (S.D.N.Y. 1997)
5. Qualitex Co. v. Jacobson Prods. Co., 514 U.S. 159 (1995).
6. Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc., 505 U.S. 763 (1992).
7. Seabrook Foods, Inc. v. Bar-Well Foods Ltd., 568 F.2d 1342 (C.C.P.A. 1977).
8. Inwood Labs., Inc. v. Ives Labs., Inc., 456 U.S. 844 (1982).
9. Ashley Furniture Indus., Inc. v. Sangiacomo N. A., Ltd., 187 F.3d 363 (2d Cir. 1999).
10. Knitwaves, Inc. v. Lollytogs, Ltd., 71 F.3d 996 (2d Cir. 1995).
11. Stuart Hall Co., Inc. v. Ampad Corp., 51 F.3d 780 (8th Cir. 1995)
12. Abercrombie & Fitch Co. v. Hunting World, Inc., 537 F.2d 4 (2d Cir. 1976).
13. Best Cellars Inc. v. Grape Finds at Dupont, Inc., 90 F. Supp 2d 431 (S.D.N.Y. 2000).
14. Landscape Forms, Inc. v. Columbia Cascade Co., 113 F.3d 373 (2d Cir. 1997).
15. Fun-Damental Too, Ltd. V. Gemmy Indus. Corp., 111 F.3d 993 (2d Cir. 1997).
16. Resource Developers, Inc. v. Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Found., Inc., 926 F.2d 134 (2d Cir. 1991).
17. George Basch Co., Inc. v. Blue Coral, Inc., 968 F.2d 1532 (2d Cir. 1992), cert. Denied, 506 U.S. 991 (1992).
18. Krueger Int'l, Inc. v. Nightingale, Inc., 915 F. Supp. 595 (S.D.N.Y. 1996).
19. Jeffrey Milstein, Inc., v. Greger, Lawlor, Roth, Inc., 58 F.3d 27 (2d Cir. 1995).

COURT DOCUMENTS

1. Brief for Petitioner, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
2. Brief for Respondent, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
3. Reply Brief for Petitioner, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
4. Court Transcript, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
5. Brief of Amici Curiae Ashley Furniture et al., Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
6. Brief of Amicus Curiae Payless Shoesource, Inc., Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
7. Brief of Amicus Curiae United States, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
8. Brief of Amicus Curiae The Int'l Trademark Ass'n, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).

9. Brief of Amicus Curiae Scott P. Zimmerman, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
10. Brief of Amicus Curiae The Int'l Mass Retail Ass'n, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
11. Brief for Petitioner, Traffix Devices, Inc. v. Mktg. Displays, Inc., No. 99-1571, slip op. (6th Cir. Aug. 24, 2000).

STATUTES

1. Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).

BOOKS

1. STEPHEN F. MOHR ET AL., U.S. TRADE DRESS LAW, EXPLORING THE BOUNDARIES (Int'l Trademark Ass'n eds., 1997).

LAW JOURNALS AND OTHER ARTICLES

- Jeffrey S. Edelstein & Cathy L. Lueders, *Recent Developments in Trade Dress Infringement Law*, 40 IDEA 105 (2000).
- Symposium, *Trade Dress Protection: The Issue of Distinctiveness and Potential Conflicts*, 27 N. KY. L. REV. 1041 (2000).
- Hugh C. Hansen, *How do you Determine when "Trade Dress" Protection Protects a Dress?*, 4 A.B.A. 217 (1999).
- Ronald L. Panitch et al., *Trade Dress and Product Configuration: Different Circuits-Different Approaches*, SE32 A.L.I. 1 (1999).
- Jeffery M. Samuels & Linda B. Samuels, *Highlights of Opinions Affecting PTO Trademark Practice*, 82 J. PAT. & TRADEMARK OFF. SOC'Y 311 (2000).
- Siegrun D. Kane, *Trademark Infringement Litigation 2000: "Eyes Wide Shut"*, 599 P.L.I./PAT 481 (2000).
- Lisa I. Fried, *High Court Makes Guarding Product Design Harder Trademark Case*, 223 N.Y.L.J. 5 (2000).
- Robert S. Greenberger et al., *Wal-Mart Wins Reversal in Trademark Lawsuit*, WALL ST. J., Mar. 23, 2000, at A3.
- Julius Rabinowitz, *'Wal-Mart' Clarifies Product Appearance Trade Dress*, NAT'L L.J., May 1, 2000, at C4.
- Dugie Sandeford, *Supreme Court Hears Arguments on Test for 'Inherent Distinctiveness'*, 5 INTELL. PROP. STRATEGIST 6 (2000).
- Martin P. Hoffman et al., *Design Patents/Other Types of Product Protection*, SE44 A.L.I. 161 (2000).
- Mary Anne Pazanowski, *Product Design is Distinctive or Protectible only if it Acquired Secondary Meaning*, 6 INTELL. PROP. STRATEGIST 6 (2000).
- Craig S. Mende, *How the High Court Sliced the Safety Net Against Knockoffs*, BRANDWEEK, Aug. 21, 2000, at 30.

TREATISES

- JOHN W. HAZARD, JR., COPYRIGHT LAW IN BUSINESS AND PRACTICE 1-42 (rev. ed. 2000).
- STEVEN Z. SZCZEPANSKI & DAVID M. ESTEIN, ECKSTROM'S LICENSING IN FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC OPERATIONS § 4.04 (1997-2000).
- 2 MATTHEW BENDER & CO., INC., TRADEMARK PROTECTION & Practice chs. 5-7 (2000).
- 1 MATTHEW BENDER & CO., INC., TRADEMARK PROTECTION & Practice chs. 1-4 (2000).
- J. THOMAS, MCCARTHY, MCCARTHY ON TRADEMARKS (2000).

CASES

- Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000).
- Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 308 (1999).
- Samara Bros. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 165 F.3d 120 (2d Cir. 1998)
- Samara Bros. v. Judy-Philippine, Inc., 969 F. Supp. 895 (S.D.N.Y. 1997)
- Qualitex Co. v. Jacobson Prods. Co., 514 U.S. 159 (1995).
- Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc., 505 U.S. 763 (1992).
- Seabrook Foods, Inc. v. Bar-Well Foods Ltd., 568 F.2d 1342 (C.C.P.A. 1977).
- Inwood Labs., Inc. v. Ives Labs., Inc., 456 U.S. 844 (1982).
- Ashley Furniture Indus., Inc. v. Sangiacomo N. A., Ltd., 187 F.3d 363 (4th Cir. 1999).
- Knitwaves, Inc. v. Lollytogs, Ltd., 71 F.3d 996 (2d Cir. 1995).
- Stuart Hall Co., Inc. v. Ampad Corp., 51 F.3d 780 (8th Cir. 1995).
- Abercrombie & Fitch Co. v. Hunting World, Inc., 537 F.2d 4 (2d Cir. 1976).
- Best Cellars Inc. v. Grape Finds at Dupont, Inc.,**
- Landscape Forms, Inc. v. Columbia Cascade Co., 113 F.3d 373 (2d Cir. 1997).
- Fun-Damental Too, Ltd. V. Gemmy Indus. Corp., 111 F.3d 993 (2d Cir. 1997).
- Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Found., Inc.,** 926 F.2d 134 (2d Cir. 1991).

George Basch Co., Inc. v. Blue Coral, Inc., 968 F.2d 1532 (2d Cir. 1992), cert. Denied, 506 U.S. 991 (1992).
Krueger Int'l, Inc. v. Nightingale, Inc., 915 F. Supp. 595 (S.D.N.Y. 1996).
Jeffrey Milstein, Inc., v. Greger, Lawlor, Roth, Inc., 58 F.3d 27 (2d Cir. 1995).

COURT DOCUMENTS

Brief for Petitioner, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
Brief for Respondent, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
Reply Brief for Petitioner, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
Court Transcript, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
Brief of Amici Curiae Ashley Furniture et al., Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
Brief of Amicus Curiae Payless Shoesource, Inc., Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
Brief of Amicus Curiae United States, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
Brief of Amicus Curiae The Int'l Trademark Ass'n, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
Brief of Amicus Curiae Scott P. Zimmerman, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
Brief of Amicus Curiae The Int'l Mass Retail Ass'n, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros., Inc., 120 S. Ct. 1339 (2000) (No. 99-150).
Brief for Petitioner, Traffix Devices, Inc. v. Mktg. Displays, Inc., No. 99-1571, slip op. (6th Cir. Aug. 24, 2000).

STATUTES

Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).

BOOKS

STEPHEN F. MOHR ET AL., U.S. TRADE DRESS LAW, EXPLORING THE BOUNDARIES (Int'l Trademark Ass'n eds., 1997).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume 1

Chapter 1

Basic Principles of Unfair Competition

I. INTRODUCTION

A. FUNDAMENTAL TENETS OF COMPETITION AND COPYING

[s 1:1 Policy of free competition](#)

[s 1:2 Policy of the public domain: free copying and imitation](#)

B. AMERICAN CONCEPT OF COMPETITION

[s 1:3 "Regulated" economy](#)

[s 1:4 Historical fear of monopoly power](#)

[s 1:5 Monopoly power and political power](#)

[s 1:6 Competition and efficiency](#)

[s 1:7 Socialism and government regulation of industry](#)

C. DEFINITIONS AND TERMINOLOGY

[s 1:8 What is unfair competition?](#)

[s 1:9 Judicial attempts at defining unfair competition](#)

[s 1:10 Some examples of unfair competition](#)

[s 1:11 Predictability versus justice in unfair competition law](#)

II. DEVELOPMENT AND GROWTH

A. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

[s 1:12 Development of unfair competition law as inherent judicial power](#)

[s 1:13 Capacity for development and growth of unfair competition law](#)

[s 1:14 Modern growth and change in scope of unfair competition law](#)

[s 1:15 - Developments in the restatement](#)

[s 1:16 - Preemption of state unfair competition law by federal law](#)

[s 1:17 - Federalization of some parts of unfair competition law](#)

B. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES

[s 1:18 Commercial morality as touchstone for unfair competition law](#)

[s 1:19 Psychological explanations for unfair competition](#)

[s 1:20 Competitive injury](#)

[s 1:21 Laissez faire versus unfair competition law](#)

III. FREE COMPETITION AND FAIR COMPETITION

[s 1:22 Unfair competition and the antitrust laws](#)

[s 1:23 - Dual policies: to promote both free competition and fair competition](#)

[s 1:24 - Acts of unfair competition are not necessarily antitrust violations](#)

[s 1:25 - Cases of overlap of antitrust and unfair competition laws](#)

IV. EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS AND THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

[s 1:26 Exclusive rights versus right to copy](#)

[s 1:27 - Public domain is the general rule](#)

[s 1:28 - Imitation of public domain materials is encouraged](#)

[s 1:29 - Free speech as a metaphor for free copying](#)

[s 1:30 - Laws granting exclusive rights do not put things into the public domain, but take them out](#)

[s 1:31 - What is in the public domain?](#)

[s 1:32 Exclusive rights and monopoly power](#)

Chapter 2

Fundamental Principles of Trademark Protection

I. POLICY RATIONALES

- [s 2:1 Introduction: reasons for trademark protection](#)
 - [s 2:2 - Policy reasons](#)
 - [s 2:3 - Economic functions of trademarks](#)
 - [s 2:4 - - Quality encouragement function](#)
 - [s 2:5 - - Reducing customers' search costs](#)
 - [s 2:6 - Trademarks are a universal phenomenon](#)
 - [s 2:7 Trademark infringement is a type of unfair competition](#)
- [s 2:8 Likelihood of confusion: keystone of both unfair competition and trademark infringement](#)
- [s 2:9 Trademark infringement as violation of standards of commercial morality](#)
- [s 2:10 Trademarks as exclusive rights or monopolies-misnomer of trademarks as "monopolies"](#)
- [s 2:11 - Judicial rejection of referring to a trademark as an anticompetitive "monopoly"](#)
 - [s 2:12 - Are trademarks unnatural "barriers to entry"?](#)
- [s 2:13 - Trademark symbols as an essential element of the competitive process](#)
 - [s 2:14 Trademarks are property rights](#)

II. GOOD WILL

- [s 2:15 Trademarks as symbol of good will](#)
 - [s 2:16 Good will](#)
 - [s 2:17 - Judicial definitions of good will](#)
 - [s 2:18 - Good will as buyer momentum](#)
- [s 2:19 - Good will as the value of a business beyond its tangible assets](#)
 - [s 2:20 - Property aspects of good will and its trademark symbol](#)
 - [s 2:21 Valuation of good will](#)
 - [s 2:22 - Rough methods of valuation](#)
 - [s 2:23 - Capitalization of good will profits](#)
 - [s 2:24 - Number of years in future for the capitalization formula](#)
- [s 2:25 - Number of years over which to average annual good will profits in the past](#)
 - [s 2:26 - Valuation methods used by the IRS](#)
 - [s 2:27 - - Bargain of the parties](#)
 - [s 2:28 - - Residual or gap method](#)
 - [s 2:29 - - Capitalization](#)
- [s 2:30 Trademark protection as protection for investment in good will](#)
 - [s 2:31 Trademark infringement as unjust enrichment](#)

III. CONSUMER PROTECTION

- [s 2:32 Trademarks and consumer protection](#)
- [s 2:33 - Trademark protection is consumer protection](#)
- [s 2:34 - Trademark infringement is a form of fraud](#)
 - [s 2:35 Consumer's right to be told the truth](#)
- [s 2:36 Consumer's intangible expectations-buying decisions](#)
 - [s 2:37 - "Psychic load" carried with trademarked products](#)
- [s 2:38 - Trademarks are criticized as creating "irrational" consumer preferences](#)

Chapter 3

The Functions of Trademarks

I. INTRODUCTION

- [s 3:1 What a trademark is](#)
- [s 3:2 What a trademark does](#)
 - [s 3:3 Use as a mark](#)

II. IDENTIFICATION

- [s 3:4 A trademark is an identifying symbol](#)
- [s 3:5 Trademarks are essential in a competitive economy](#)
- [s 3:6 Trademarks answer the question: "who are you?"](#)
- [s 3:7 Trademark need not disclose the name of its owner](#)

III. SOURCE

- [s 3:8 Early view: trademarks only indicate a physical source of goods](#)
- [s 3:9 Modern view: a trademark indicates a single, albeit anonymous, source](#)

IV. QUALITY

[s 3:10 Trademark signifies that all goods sold under it are of equal quality](#)
[s 3:11 Under the quality function, trademarks may be licensed for use by others](#)

V. ADVERTISING

[s 3:12 Advertising function](#)

Chapter 4

Terminology in Trademark and Unfair Competition Law

I. INTRODUCTION

[s 4:1 Defining terms of art](#)

[s 4:2 Archaic and modern definitions of legal terms of art](#)

II. ARCHAIC DEFINITIONS

[s 4:3 Archaic definitions of terms](#)

[s 4:4 - "Technical trademark"](#)

[s 4:5 - "Trade name"](#)

[s 4:6 - Development in the law: expanding the fold of "trademarks"](#)

[s 4:7 - "Trade name" as denoting the name of a business](#)

[s 4:8 - Definitions used by the restatement of torts](#)

[s 4:9 - Summary of archaic definitions](#)

III. MODERN DEFINITIONS

[s 4:10 Modern definitions of terms-some reasons for changing definitions](#)

[s 4:11 - "Unfair trade practices"](#)

[s 4:12 - Modern "trademark"](#)

[s 4:13 - Modern "trade name"](#)

[s 4:14 - Modern "service mark"](#)

[s 4:15 - Modern "certification mark"](#)

[s 4:16 - Modern "collective mark"](#)

[s 4:17 - "Mark"](#)

[s 4:18 - "Brand name"](#)

[s 4:19 - Two-fold meaning of "trademark"](#)

[s 4:20 Comment: semantic confusion about basic legal terms of art](#)

Chapter 5

Historical Basis of Trademarks and Legislative History

[s 5:1 Early origins of trade symbols](#)

[s 5:2 Development of trademarks in Anglo-American common law](#)

[s 5:3 History of United States trademark legislation](#)

[s 5:4 Legislative history of federal Trademark Act of 1946: the Lanham Act](#)

[s 5:5 Amendments to the Lanham Act](#)

[s 5:6 - Amendments from 1947 to 1984](#)

[s 5:7 - Trademark Counterfeiting Act of 1984](#)

[s 5:8 - Trademark Clarification Act of 1984](#)

[s 5:9 - Trademark Law Revision Act of 1988](#)

[s 5:10 - Lanham Act amendments since 1988](#)

Chapter 6

Trademarks Compared to Patents and Copyrights

I. OVERALL COMPARISON OF PATENTS, TRADEMARKS AND COPYRIGHTS

[s 6:1 Confusion in the legal world](#)

[s 6:2 Differing constitutional basis](#)

[s 6:3 Distinct policies of patents, trademarks, and copyrights](#)

[s 6:4 Common denominators of patents, trademarks and copyrights](#)

[s 6:5 A given product may be protectable by all three areas of the law](#)

[s 6:6 Chart: simplified relationships-patents, trademarks and copyrights](#)

II. PATENTS COMPARED TO TRADEMARKS

- [s 6:7 Types of patents](#)
- [s 6:8 Patents and trademarks: differences](#)
- [s 6:9 Both patent grants and trademark registrations are handled by the United States Patent and Trademark Office](#)
- [s 6:10 Utility patent and trademark conflict: product shapes](#)
- [s 6:11 Design patents and trademarks](#)
- [s 6:12 Effect of patent expiration on trademark](#)

III. COPYRIGHTS COMPARED TO TRADEMARKS

- [s 6:13 Nature of copyright](#)
- [s 6:14 Scope of exclusivity: copyright and trademark compared](#)
- [s 6:15 Federal copyright preemption of state law](#)
- [s 6:16 Monetary recovery under both copyright and trademark law](#)

IV. CAN A LABEL OR TRADEMARK BE COPYRIGHTED?

- [s 6:17 Can a trademark be copyrighted?](#)
- [s 6:18 - Pictures and designs](#)
- [s 6:19 - Slogans and words](#)
- [s 6:20 - Copyright statute and regulations](#)
- [s 6:21 Examples of copyrightable matter on a label](#)
- [s 6:22 Copyright for advertising themes](#)
- [s 6:23 Test of copyright infringement](#)
- [s 6:24 Copying is essential for copyright infringement](#)

V. COPYRIGHT FOR COMMERCIAL WORKS AND ADVERTISING

- [s 6:25 Elements of copyright notice](#)
- [s 6:26 Trademark in copyright notice](#)
- [s 6:27 Trademark infringement and false advertising in connection with copyright infringement](#)
- [s 6:28 Registration of claim to copyright](#)
- [s 6:29 Copyrightability of labels](#)
- [s 6:30 Copyright in advertising materials, catalogs and price lists](#)
- [s 6:31 Trademark protection in works out of copyright](#)

Chapter 7

Trademark and Trade Dress Formats

I. USUAL TRADEMARK FORMATS

A. MULTIPLE MARKS ON ONE PRODUCT

- [s 7:1 Multiple marks of one owner](#)
- [s 7:2 - Product or service can be identified by more than one mark](#)
- [s 7:3 - Size and position of mark](#)
- [s 7:4 - Background designs](#)
- [s 7:5 - House marks](#)
- [s 7:6 - Federal registration](#)
- [s 7:7 - Too many marks: more is less](#)
- [s 7:8 Multiple marks of multiple owners](#)

B. TYPES OF MARKS

- [s 7:9 Letters as marks](#)
- [s 7:10 - Scope of protection of arbitrary letter combinations](#)
- [s 7:11 - Validity and strength of letter marks](#)
- [s 7:12 - Broadcast station call letters](#)
- [s 7:13 - Telephone number letter combinations](#)
- [s 7:14 Numbers as marks](#)
- [s 7:15 - Validity and strength of number marks](#)
- [s 7:16 - Numbers as style or grade designations](#)
- [s 7:17 - Broadcast frequency designations](#)
- [s 7:17.1 Internet domain names](#)
- [s 7:18 Abbreviations and nicknames as marks](#)
- [s 7:19 Slogans as marks](#)
- [s 7:20 - Slogans can serve as marks](#)
- [s 7:21 - Slogans incorporating other marks](#)
- [s 7:22 - Descriptive slogans](#)

- [s 7:23 - Common phrases used as slogans](#)
- [s 7:24 Symbols and designs which are decorative or ornamental](#)
- [s 7:25 Distinctive designs and symbols](#)
- [s 7:26 Designs, shapes and symbols as background for word marks](#)
- [s 7:27 - Separate commercial impression test](#)
- [s 7:28 - Comment: tests for background designs](#)
- [s 7:29 - Inherently distinctive and non-distinctive designs](#)
- [s 7:30 "Look for" promotion](#)
- [s 7:31 Multiple repetition of mark as background](#)
- [s 7:32 Design or pattern uniformly covering surface of package or product](#)
- [s 7:33 Geometric shapes](#)
- [s 7:34 Geometric shapes and symbols as strong or weak marks](#)
- [s 7:35 Descriptive designs, symbols and pictures](#)
- [s 7:36 - Pictures that describe goods or services](#)
- [s 7:37 - Generic or functional pictures](#)
- [s 7:38 Shape and location of label](#)

II. COLOR

- [s 7:39 Color as element of trademark](#)
- [s 7:40 - Introduction](#)
- [s 7:41 - Traditional "single product color" rule](#)
- [s 7:42 - Federal Circuit's challenge to the traditional rule](#)
- [s 7:43 - Rejection of the Federal Circuit rule](#)
- [s 7:44 - 1995 Qualitex rule](#)
- [s 7:45 Color in connection with defined designs](#)
- [s 7:46 Trademark rights in design of non-specified color](#)
- [s 7:47 Color of liquid products](#)
- [s 7:48 Color in combination with building designs and business vehicles](#)
- [s 7:49 Functional uses of colors are not protectable](#)
- [s 7:50 Drug capsule colors](#)
- [s 7:51 Author's comment on drug capsule colors](#)
- [s 7:52 Color as generic or descriptive indication](#)

III. **TRADE DRESS** IN **PRODUCT** AND **CONTAINER SHAPES**

A. OVERVIEW OF TRADE DRESS IN PRODUCT SHAPE

- [s 7:53 State law protection](#)
- [s 7:54 Federal protection](#)

B. FEDERAL PREEMPTION OF STATE LAW

- [s 7:55 1964 Sears-Compco cases](#)
- [s 7:56 Retreat from the generalities of Sears-Compco](#)
- [s 7:57 Bonito Boats case](#)

C. STATE AND FEDERAL PROTECTION OF PRODUCT AND CONTAINER SHAPES

- [s 7:58 Product configurations](#)
- [s 7:59 Container shapes](#)
- [s 7:60 Intentional palming off](#)
- [s 7:61 Federal protection](#)
- [s 7:62 Product shape as trade dress](#)

IV. FUNCTIONALITY

A. FUNCTIONAL FEATURES CANNOT BE TRADE DRESS OR TRADEMARKS

- [s 7:63 Policy reasons](#)
- [s 7:64 - Do not create "patent-like" rights of exclusion](#)
- [s 7:65 - Right to compete: available alternative designs](#)
- [s 7:66 De facto secondary meaning for functional features](#)

B. UTILITARIAN FUNCTIONALITY

- [s 7:67 Plethora of definitions](#)
- [s 7:68 - Two basic definitions of functionality](#)
- [s 7:69 - Survey of functionality definitions of the courts](#)
- [s 7:69.1 - Jury instructions on functionality](#)

- [s 7:70 Look to functionality of the claimed feature or features](#)
- [s 7:71 Functionality is an issue of fact](#)
- [s 7:72 Burden of proof on functionality issue](#)
- [s 7:73 Evidence relevant to the functionality issue](#)
- [s 7:74 - Promotion touting utilitarian advantages](#)
- [s 7:75 - Alternative designs available](#)
- [s 7:76 Combination of individually functional features](#)
- [s 7:77 Two-dimensional functional designs](#)
- [s 7:78 Use of trademark is needed to fairly compete](#)

C. AESTHETIC FUNCTIONALITY

- [s 7:79 1938 Restatement and the Pagliero case](#)
- [s 7:80 Uneven use of the aesthetic functionality theory in the modern courts](#)
- [s 7:81 Author's comment on "aesthetic functionality"](#)
- [s 7:82 "Defensive" aesthetic functionality](#)
- [s 7:83 Author's comment: "hard cases": words that are the product](#)

D. EFFECT OF REGISTRATION ON FUNCTIONALITY

- [s 7:84 Incontestable registration and functionality](#)

E. ILLUSTRATIVE LIST OF FEATURES HELD FUNCTIONAL AND NON-FUNCTIONAL

- [s 7:85 Features held functional](#)
- [s 7:86 Features held non-functional](#)

F. FUNCTIONALITY OF PACKAGING MATERIALS AND COLORS

- [s 7:87 Functional or commonplace packaging](#)
- [s 7:88 Color as a functional feature](#)

H. UTILITY PATENTS

- [s 7:89 As evidence of functionality](#)

G. DESIGN PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

- [s 7:90 Nature of a design patent](#)
- [s 7:91 Dual design patent and trademark or trade dress protection](#)
- [s 7:92 Reconciling the SHREDDED WHEAT dictum](#)
- [s 7:93 Design patent as evidence of non-functionality](#)

V. REGISTRATION OF CONTAINER AND PRODUCT CONFIGURATIONS

A. FEDERAL REGISTRATION

- [s 7:94 Principal Register](#)
- [s 7:95 Supplemental Register](#)

B. EFFECT OF SEARS-COMPCO

- [s 7:96 Effect on federal registration](#)
- [s 7:97 - Argument for preemption of federal registration](#)
- [s 7:98 - Argument against preemption of federal registration](#)
- [s 7:99 - Resolution of the issue by the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals](#)

VI. OTHER TRADEMARK FORMATS

- [s 7:100 Buildings-protection of building exterior and interior](#)
- [s 7:101 - Federal registration as a trademark](#)
- [s 7:102 Vehicles](#)
- [s 7:103 Clothing](#)
- [s 7:104 Sound marks](#)
- [s 7:105 Fragrance marks](#)

Chapter 8

Trade Dress

I. BASIC RULES OF TRADE DRESS PROTECTION

- [s 8:1 Trade dress compared to trademarks](#)
- [s 8:2 - Focus on totality of elements](#)
- [s 8:3 - Author's comment on the need to identify the elements of trade dress](#)
- [s 8:4 What constitutes trade dress](#)
- [s 8:5 Product shape as trade dress](#)
- [s 8:5.1 Trade dress in a line of different products or packages](#)
- [s 8:6 Mere marketing theme or style of doing business is not protectable](#)
- [s 8:7 Federal protection of trade dress](#)

II. SECONDARY MEANING FOR TRADE DRESS PROTECTION

- [s 8:8 Traditional rule](#)
- [s 8:9 Intentional copying as a substitute for secondary meaning](#)
- [s 8:10 Modern rule-pre-Taco Cabana](#)
- [s 8:11 - Rule in Taco Cabana](#)
- [s 8:12 - Different rule for product shape than for other trade dress formats?](#)
- [s 8:13 Inherently distinctive trade dress](#)
- [s 8:14 Trade dress marketed under differing word marks](#)

III. TEST OF UNFAIR COMPETITION IN TRADE DRESS SIMULATION: LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION

- [s 8:15 Comparison of conflicting trade dresses](#)
- [s 8:16 Can defendant's mark on a look-alike prevent confusion?](#)
- [s 8:17 Illustrations](#)
- [s 8:18 Reasonable consumer standard in trade dress protection](#)
- [s 8:19 Intentional copying of trade dress as palming off](#)

IV. DEFENSES

- [s 8:20 Functional or commonplace packaging](#)
- [s 8:21 Imitation of trade dress: Sears-Compco defense](#)